

August 15, 1986

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 15 1986

DIVISION OF  
OIL, GAS & MINING

Sandra Thompson  
525 South 1000 East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102

Diane Nielson  
Director of Oil Gas & Mining  
355 W N. Temple  
3 Triad Center  
Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

To whom it may concern:

This letter is to bring to your attention the possibility that re-opening Kennecott might not be in the best interests of Utah.

As per a telephone conversation with Wayne Heberg on August 4, 1986 where he stated that a notice was given in the local papers on July 3, 1986 that anyone concerned had 30 days to give notice. I actively seek out any information about Kennecott and did not see it. During that period I was working with a reporter at the Deseret News about the possibility of incomplete reporting.

Some of the concerns which I feel may not have been adequately addressed are:

1: Ground water studies have not been completed and preliminary results show a serious problem. Kennecott should not be allowed to re-open until it is settled that no further pollution will occur. This does not seem to be the case as Kennecott is planning to re-open and go into production during modernization.

*Increased*  
2: Heightened fuel bills due to inversions in the winter *where* smog is trapped in the valleys and the sun can not get through to break it up, resulting in very cold weather while surrounding areas are enjoying much warmer weather. If every customer along the Wasatch front paid an extra \$100 a year the total would be \$41,000,000. After Mountain Fuel meets their expenses the profits are paid to the share holders or invested and

0023

the money from costomers paychecks and the added expense of local businesses is leaving the community. I don't see how the benefits from Kennecott could out weigh this problem.

3: A study done by the Utah Department of Employment Security, May 1985 states the Kennecott layoffs have not and will not be backbreaking blow the the business activity. During that period ~~un~~employment rates decreased and good job growth with a decrease in ~~un~~employment insurance claims. An analaysis of 18 heavily dependent supplies actually increased their combined employment by nearly 50 workers during the period that included the largest single reduction of force at Kennecott.

4: A Kennecott employee earning \$7.29 and hour, \$15,164 a year, with a wife and one child would not have to pay any taxes under the new tax reform and would add to the tax burden.

5: The course of our business and economic delvelopment is being seriously ~~con~~templated with concerns as to whether we will have a smokestack based economy or whether we will move in a high tech direction. How important are clear skys to companies (lets say Los Angeles) that wish to relocate or expand? Impact studies show that Kennecott is the single largest contributor to air polution being above automobiles. Why is all that money being spent to improve automobile emmisions (which have improved 60% over that last ten years) and Kennecott planning to go into full production and increasing their polution.

I think <sup>HERE</sup> ~~their~~ is a possibility that those in charge have wrongly assumed that Kennecott was a benefit to Utah when actually thay have used us for doormats and are walking all over us. I am planning to take a debate class this fall under Ted Wilson to bring out the pros and cons of the matter. I plan to make a comparative study as to the correlation between consumption of fuel and the weather. As this won't be completed for several months and this notice being given I am hoping you will take into consideration what I have written. Otherwise, I will find out what I can do to get and injuction until the all concerns have been adequately addressed. I hope it isn't too late and we havn't been ~~condemned~~ to suffer the consequences of poor planning.

Thank You,

*Sandra Thompson*

Sandra Thompson

(801) 521-0382